

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
1	NO FLOODWALLS!	The Project Delivery Team (PDT) is required to evaluate all types of flood control measures including floodwalls. As part of the planning process all measures will be screened as to their cost effectiveness, efficiency, completeness and effectiveness. Measures remaining for further evaluation will be combined to form the carried alternatives. Note that floodwalls require less land coverage than levees and will remain a considered option for providing flood protection. We recognize your concern that floodwalls would obstruct or distract from your view of the river and if proposed we will evaluate and mitigate for this effect as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) report.
2	Deepen or dredge the Truckee near Lockwood	A brief examination of this option indicates that it may address the high water at Rainbow Bend. However, additional study needs to be done to determine how this measure may impact upstream and downstream sections of the river as well as what, if any, long term operation and maintenance requirements (e.g., annual dredging) may be required. Additionally, the environmental effects of this measure will need to be identified and may be significant enough to affect its feasibility.
3	Remove and replace the bridges at Lockwood and Painted Rock	Storey County is considering a new bridge at Painted Rock. We are determining whether the realignment or the raising of the Rainbow Bend Bridge can be a viable part of the study. The replacement of any of the remaining bridges is likely beyond the scope of this study as this is another federal agency's jurisdiction.
4	Remove and replace the culverts along Long Valley Creek	This is being evaluated as part of the solution to Rainbow Bend's flooding problem.
5	Upstream detention basin on Long Valley Creek	This is being evaluated as part of the solution to Rainbow Bend's flooding problem.
6	Detention basins at Mustang, pits at Tracy and other locations along the Truckee River, upstream and downstream of Lockwood.	Detention basins are being evaluated at Mustang. The PDT is going back to look at other locations including Lockwood and other areas along the Truckee River for their potential to temporarily store water.
7	Widen the Truckee River at Lockwood, place railroad on a trestle and put small weirs along Long Valley to attenuate the peak flow runoff.	Based on the economic evaluation of damages at Rainbow Bend, this solution would not be economically viable.
8	Relocating or buy-outs of residents in Lockwood is unacceptable. The 402 homes are a barely economical association and cannot support community services with fewer residents.	Protection of property is our first priority – buyout or relocation is a last option. There is currently no plan to relocate or buy out Rainbow Bend residents being considered. When the project is authorized the Corps will evaluate land needs and will follow the following process: 1) Raising or flood proofing individual structures; 2) Protecting structures with flood walls, levees, berms, ring levees, etc.; 3) Request a flowage easement which would prohibit residential habitation within the easement.
9	Protect the existing water treatment plant at Lockwood	Any proposed alternative will be compared to existing conditions; infrastructure not previously affected will be mitigated to prevent damage from occurring; currently, none of the alternatives being evaluated induce flooding of the water treatment plant.
10	No way on Alternative 3. Opposition to channel benching	Comment noted.
11	Realign the confluence of Long Valley Creek with the Truckee River.	This is being evaluated as part of the solution to Rainbow Bend's flooding problem.
12	Local infrastructure must be protected	Any proposed alternative will be compared to existing conditions; infrastructure not previously affected will be mitigated to prevent damage from occurring.

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
13	Dredge river from Vista to Mustang	The Corps will study dredging, specifically the extent of reduction in flows depths this would provide; however, at a initial glance there are channel stability and environmental concerns which too may drive the costs beyond what is viably supportable to carry this measure.
14	Detention basin on county property above Lockwood bridge	The PDT is going back to look at other locations not previously considered along the Truckee River for their potential to temporarily store water.
15	Detention basin at UNR farms	A detention basin at UNR farms is included in some of the proposed project alternatives.
16	Detention basin on Steamboat Creek at Huffaker Hills	A detention basin on Steamboat creek at Huffaker Hills is a flood control measure being considered as part of the project alternatives.
17	Benching on north side of Truckee River across from Lockwood and Rainbow Bend.	A brief examination of this option indicates that there is not sufficient space to create a bench that would lower water surface elevations at Rainbow Bend. The Corps did evaluate removing some of this area with resulting water levels on the south side of the river decreasing. This measure will continue to be further evaluated.
18	Clean up river bed from California to Pyramid Lake, flooding caused by debris and snags	The Corps' evaluation indicates that the removal of debris and snags alone would not significantly reduce major flood events. The Corps will consider debris and snag removal in conjunction with other measures.
19	Stream flow controls on Long Valley Creek	This is being evaluated as part of the solution to Rainbow Bend's flooding problem.
20	Water master at Lake Tahoe to hold more water	The dam at Lake Tahoe was built in 1909. Only once since that time, has Lake Tahoe made a significant contribution to a flood in the Reno area. Therefore, it should be realized that changing the law that governs Lake Tahoe water surface elevation is helpful only in rare circumstances. As an example, in December of 1995, a peak flow of 20,800 cfs passed through and flooded the downtown Reno and Sparks area. During this event, Lake Tahoe Dam released 0 cfs. On January 1, 1997, Lake Tahoe was close to its maximum legal elevation of 6,229.1 feet. Once the lake hits this level, the Federal Water master must release 2,500 cfs according to a longstanding federal court decree. Unfortunately, the warm tropical storm melted much of the snow around the lake and caused it to rise to maximum permissible level, thus inducing the mandated release from the dam. The Lake Tahoe release of 2,500 cfs contributed roughly 10% or more of the flow that caused flooding in the Reno area. The Corps believes the 1997 event had a peak flow of 23,000 cfs in downtown Reno. Had Lake Tahoe made no releases during the 5 worst days of the storm, it would have only raised the lake 2.5 inches and caused no flooding to homes around the lake. However, law mandated the Lake Tahoe discharge. Washoe County has made inquiry into getting this law changed, which would require Federal legislation.
21	No detention basin at Mustang Ranch	The detention basin at Mustang Ranch is being closely evaluated to determine its efficiency and cost effectiveness for flood control (its ability to take off the peak flow during high flows). If this evaluation demonstrates that the benefits achieved of this detention basin exceed the costs it may be considered as part of the recommended plan.
22	No intake through or near Lockwood for detention at Mustang Ranch	The intake will be located just downstream of Lockwood. This has to be the required location as the diversion must be made sufficiently upstream of the detention storage area so that enough slope is available for the water to proceed from the diversion point to the detention basin site nearly 1.5 miles downstream.

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
23	No benching at Vista Reefs	Comment noted
24	Bench or relieve pinch point at railroad just below Rainbow Bend	The north bank allows little widening of the Truckee River prior to undermining the railroad/highway embankment. As previously suggested, a trestle or bridge structure would have to be placed beneath the railroad for support. This would be prohibitively expensive, and not in the Federal interest when compared to the existing risk of damages to the Lockwood area. This proposal could be retained as a potentially locally preferred plan; however, the local interests would have to bear a very high majority of the costs to implement.
25	Erosion issues at railroad need to be part of the process	The north bank erosion potential will be included in the assessment of all plans to address flooding by the Lockwood area due to the Truckee River.
26	Remove culverts at Long Valley Creek crossing, replace with bridge, currently a bottleneck	This is being evaluated as part of the solution to Rainbow Bend's flooding problem.
27	Make certain that elevations/topography matches reality. Developer raised land to build houses (post 1986)	Comment noted. Floor elevations and topography are being used to evaluate the effects of the alternatives on existing structures.
28	No extra water, do something above Reno	Comment noted. Flood control measures above Reno are being evaluated as part of the project.
29	Raise all homes not just a few	Based on information provided at the workshop, it is unlikely that the Corps would propose removing homes in the Rainbow Bend area. Raising homes may be an option but the Corps would only propose raising those homes that are likely to be flooded by the increased flows.
30	Raising, Relocating, etc. a few homes affected by water means a negative effect on appreciation of all homes in Association	This information is taken into consideration when mitigation measures are being evaluated.
31	Go to Congress and change laws at Truckee	The Corps could evaluate the effects of a change in the law and could even recommend a change in the law (via a Chief's Report) if that were the best solution to the problem. However, referring to the response to comment 20 above, changing the Tahoe release law would have little effect on the overall flood problem in Reno.
32	Mitigating ponds at Mustang, Tracey/Granite Pit, at Orchard (exit) at Paiute Pit	Detention basins are being evaluated at Mustang. The PDT is going back to look at other locations not previously considered along the Truckee River for their potential to temporarily store water.
33	Pull soft plug at Truckee Canal (TCID), 2000 cfs alone!	Use of the Truckee Canal will be studied. While this suggestion might be an acceptable mitigation measure for downstream flows diversion of water from the Truckee River (even floodwaters) into an adjacent watershed poses additional issues, like effects on water rights, may need to be addressed.
34	Build (raise) a new bridge at Mustang, McCarran Ranch and Painted Rock	Storey County is considering a new bridge at Painted Rock. We are determining whether the realignment or the raising of the Rainbow Bend Bridge can be a viable part of the study. The replacement of any of the remaining bridges is likely beyond the scope of this study as this is another federal agency's jurisdiction.

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
35	Why does USACE favor Washoe County over Storey County?	<p>The USACE is following the direction of Congress to study flooding problems in the Meadows and restoration potential along the Truckee River. In complying with this direction from Congress, Washoe County has a direct interest in the outcome of the study and has indicated a willingness to cost-share in an eventual project. The Corps understands that residents in Storey County are opposed to the project but we are obligated to respond to Congress's direction to study the problems. Any adverse effect of the project on residents of Storey County will be mitigated. A brief history of the project may help you to understand the relationship between the Corps and Washoe County. The original authorized project (1988) occurred solely within Washoe County, the project was deferred in 1992 because the project lacked economic feasibility; however, in 1994 due to flood threats and high population growth, Washoe County requested the project to be reactivated. In 1996, the Corps was authorized to reevaluate (via a General Reevaluation Report - GRR) the project in two phases: 1) reconnaissance; and 2) feature development, cost benefit analysis and cost allocation. Flooding in 1997 caused \$450 million in damages and added complexity and scope to the project. The reconnaissance study (Aug 1997) determined potential construction feasibility of the project; thus, phase two of the project was initiated in 1998. Since these beginnings Washoe County has worked closely with the Corps on the project and has raised public moneys to pay for the construction of the project. However, currently, Corps project study costs have been funded entirely by Federal dollars and the Corps is need of a local sponsor to complete this study. Selection of the local sponsor will be based on financial capability and the ability to meet project obligations including but not limited to operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of the constructed project, and acquisition of real estate needed for the project. Subagreements with other interested entities (e.g. cities, counties, tribes,...) with the local sponsor will allow for representation, technical expertise and input into the project process so that all concerns can be heard and considered for the project.</p>
36	I'm against any "holding" of water above Vista in Truckee Meadows because of Washoe County's "control of the water! 2000 CFS alone from Truckee Canal (TCID) would stop all of this without dollars! But what about your JOBS?	<p>Use of the Truckee Canal will be studied. While this suggestion might be an acceptable mitigation measure for downstream flows diversion of water from the Truckee River (even floodwaters) into an adjacent watershed poses additional issues, like water rights, will be addressed.</p>
37	What will USACE or anyone else do when proposed solutions cause increased erosion to my private property? (along river below Painted Rock, indicating Painted Rock Bridge upstream and downstream a multi-channel area of the river.)	<p>Increased erosion caused by the additional flows is an adverse effect that the Corps would mitigate. At this point, we are identifying where these locations are and then proposing mitigation. The Painted Rock Bridge is one such area and some form of bank protection is one possible mitigation measure to arrest any further erosion.</p>
38	Please send me a FEMA map for Rainbow Bend, and a map for upstream and downstream of Rainbow Bend. 3 maps. Thanks.	<p>Maps have been provided.</p>

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
39	Fear of my property being confiscated	<p>Land needed for the project will be identified once an authorized project is in place, this does not occur during the feasibility phase that the study is currently in. Furthermore, the property interests of landowners who may be affected by a public project are protected from confiscation under the Fifth Amendment to the US Constitution. That passage states in part as follows: “. . . ; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”</p> <p>Property that may be required for a public purpose (for example, to locate a levee or dam or to be occasionally or permanently inundated by flood waters) will be carefully considered and identified as needed by County, State, or Federal Governments. The owner will be notified by the responsible public entity of the legitimate need.</p> <p>Under the power of eminent domain, the public agency will have the authority to buy or rent private land and structures, must follow due process to do so, and must offer fair market value for the rights in the property needed. The dollar amount offered is based on a valuation that is performed by a qualified, Government-approved appraiser.</p> <p>The property owner has the right to disagree with the appraised value. In that event, negotiations take place between the owner and the public agency’s representatives to arrive at a mutually acceptable sales price. If discussions are fruitless, both parties have the right to request and receive relief through the court system.</p>
40	Please send me water elevations (1, 2, & 3) at “McCarran Ranch” Bridge.	Water elevations have been provided.
41	If the 1988 and 1996 Flood Study premise was to contain/control excess water upstream of vista gauge, when and why did the premise change to allow some excess water to flow past vista gauge and into Storey County creating more frequent flooding, all control & containment needs to occur upstream of the vista gauge.	The solutions changed when it became clear through hydraulic modeling that despite including two detention basins upstream of the Vista gauge, as well as setback levees could not contain the 100-year flows. Historically, the project conveyed some flows past Vista; the Reconnaissance Study (dated October 1997) indicated that the proposed plan in 1985 (and authorized in 1988) was investigated to convey 18,500 cfs at the Vista gauge.
42	Why doesn’t the Corps of Engineers see to the cleanup of our River near Exit 22 (or 2 miles if it is EPA, get on them – debris is what needs to be cleaned up).	The Corps’ evaluation indicates that the removal of debris and snags alone would not significantly reduce major flood events. The Corps will consider debris and snag removal in conjunction with other measures.
43	I received your Newsletter postmarked October 22nd after work on the 26th. It seems to me that if you want people to attend your meetings and have some input into them that you should make sure you mail them out in a timely manner. People have schedules, commitments and work that they need to arrange. With that said I have a few questions after reading your Newsletter today.	The Corps provides a website (www.spk.usace.army.mil/projects/civil/truckeemeadows) and a monthly newsletter as part of our efforts to communicate with the general public and interested parties on what is happening on the project. The October Workshop was announced both in the September and October newsletters, and on our Website since September. The Corps keeps the Website current of upcoming meetings. Additionally, at the October 26th public workshop at Rainbow Bend anyone that wanted a phone call to update them of the next meeting indicated that on their comment card. Monthly newsletters can be anticipated to be available during the fourth week of the month.

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
44	<p>Regarding the October Newsletter, Levee Use and Considerations in Urban Areas. In this section you talk about ‘The levee construction will require a permanent real estate easement to install the levee section...’ Just EXACTLY what are you meaning by this? and my neighbors upstream? Are you saying that you will and/or can TAKE a 15-foot wide maintenance access on my (or other’s) property to maintain this? My property runs about 900+ feet along the Truckee River in Wadsworth. Across the river from me is Tribal land. Down river from me is Tribal land. If things ‘run as usual’ around here no will not get your permanent real estate easement from them. Does this mean you plan on TAKING that easement on individual properties like mine? You also state ‘The levee crown will include a 12-foot patrol road and may also be used for recreation or bicycle trails.’ Do you plan on turning people’s private property into some kind of over-used, noisy infringement on our privacy? People who bought acreage on the river did so for a reason. So we could have privacy and be away from ‘city life’ and all that goes with it. Just what do you mean by the ‘patrol road’?</p>	<p>The October Newsletter discussion of levees was provided as a general overview of what levees are. Flood control alternatives being studied in the Truckee Meadows area include the use of levees, primarily in the Sparks area between I-395 and Vista; at this time no levees are proposed for the downstream of the river, east of Vista.</p> <p>If levees were to be proposed, the patrol road could have limited access to the public. The statement about recreation trails referred to levees proposed in the Truckee Meadows area. The patrol roads are necessary for maintenance personnel to inspect the levee, especially during high water events.</p>
45	<p>As you can see from the following [Reno Gazette Journal article County Approves River Flood Control Funds dated October 26, 2004] our concerns are more than well founded. It would appear that Mr. Urban was a bit less than candid at Tuesday's meeting; it seems that regardless of the smoke blown up our collective tailpipes tonight, the fix is in, and we went through yet another exercise in futility, a monumental waste of our time and effort. Attempting to deal in good faith is becoming harder as each meeting passes. I guess if they have \$6.2M to bet on the come, we ought to just shut down the game before they bankrupt the house.</p>	<p>Washoe County has instituted the 1/8-cent sales tax for flood control and also has available Question 1 funds (The Nevada Clean Water, Parks and Wildlife Bond) in the amount of \$10 million to be used for enhancement and restoration of the Truckee River corridor. Washoe County is using these funds to acquire land from willing sellers but they must comply with local regulations for land use. Washoe County cannot purchase land in Storey County unless there is a willing seller. A sponsor can acquire land at any time for the project at their own risk only when there is an authorized project from Congress and a signed Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between the Corps and a non-federal sponsor can the sponsor be assured of receiving credit towards the sharing of the project costs. As part of the PCA it is the non-federal sponsors responsibility to acquire lands, easements, rights of way, relocation, and disposal areas. When the project is authorized the Corps will evaluate land needs and will follow the following process: 1) Raising or flood proofing individual structures; 2) Protecting structures with flood walls, levees, berms, ring levees, etc.; 3) Request a flowage easement which would prohibit residential habitation within the easement.</p>

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
46	<p>There is no question in my mind that the Corps and Washoe County are being very disingenuous. What is the point of wasting our time in these stupid little meetings and cheesy little group efforts when you (the Corps and Washoe County) have already made up your minds. Accountability will be playing a role here. As you are aware, the flood information and calculations are based on erroneous data. I don't care how many "experts" you throw at this, in 1997 Painted Rock was flooded out and the bridge was nearly destroyed. The pictures of the damage speak louder than the Corps' "experts" opinions. If you people want a fight, then that is what you'll get. I can't stand being lied to and will not tolerate it here. I think the next time there is one of these meetings, I'll send you a bill for my time. Rest assured we will be in touch with our Commissioners and complaints will fly</p>	<p>The hydraulic data presented at the October 26 public workshop was a preliminary model to capture upstream project features to show the project delivery team and help in formulation of the draft flood control and/or restoration features. Over the next few months the Corps will be refining this model which will include calibration to the 1997 flood and ensuring that all structural features (e.g., bridges, trusses, culverts, etc.) are included. Additionally, the Corps will collect river bottom topography data in the Spring of 2005 for input into the model. Any specific details that residents can provide regarding the 1997 flood should be provided to the Corps for inclusion in the model.</p>
47	<p>I find it difficult to believe that with all of the land acquisition you have already approved for this project you don't know the laws regarding condemnation of property within another county. You can rest assured I will be checking into that myself.</p>	<p>The Corps has not approved any land acquisition for this project at this time. A sponsor can acquire land at any time for the project at their own risk only when there is an authorized project from Congress and a signed Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between the Corps and a non-federal sponsor can the sponsor be assured of receiving credit towards the sharing of the project costs. The Corps cannot direct acquisition for the project until after the project is authorized by Congress. Washoe County cannot condemn lands in another county. Washoe County has only purchased land in Storey County from willing sellers.</p>
48	<p>In your notice about the workshop you stated the reason for having it in Rainbow Bend was due to a scheduling problem. That is a blatant lie and if you can do that in writing when many people know it is a lie, what are you doing behind the scenes. Paul Urban deliberately scheduled the meeting to be held at Wadsworth when a year ago you had promised to be back to Rainbow Bend with more information. RB residents objected and Paul very wisely promised to be back to Rainbow Bend with more information. RB residents objected and Paul very wisely rescheduled the meeting for RB. Last night you made the comment that you'd be back "in the area". I would suggest you make sure you schedule the meeting at Rainbow Bend since that is where the majority of the residents affected by your plans reside.</p>	<p>The meeting held on October 26th was a Corps planned meeting. The Corps attempts to locate public meeting in a geographical midpoint to the audience it is trying to reach; the project extends to Pyramid Lake with the logical midpoint to be in the vicinity of Wadsworth. The Wadsworth schoolhouse has been used in the past by other agencies for public meetings and was being pursued for the October 26 public workshop. However, no response was ever received from our point of contact on the availability of the schoolhouse for this date and a change in venue was required. We appreciate the responsiveness of the Rainbow Bend community and their willingness to let us use their facilities especially on the short notice that was required.</p>

No.	Issue/Recommendation/Comment	Response
49	We would not be so "difficult" to work with if you were completely truthful and really wanted to work with us. I still say it is Washoe County's problem and they should solve it there and upstream. Since that is not going to happen, we would like to see something palatable that does not ruin our lifestyle by the river nor depreciate the value of our homes.	In 1964, Congress authorized interim channel improvement on the Truckee River and tributaries in California and Nevada for flood control. The Corps is studying the entire watershed because flooding along the Truckee River is not just a problem in Washoe County. The Corps will continue to work with residents to identify what acceptable solutions could be implemented.
50	I represent the owner of property along the Truckee river from roughly mustang to a mile past Tracy. The Tahoe Reno industrial center and McCarran ranch. I am interested in the impacts to the subject property are there maps available for this stretch of river??	The maps have been provided.